



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/027,988	12/20/2001	Martin J. Medina	H0001983	2358

7590

11/29/2005

Intellectual Property
Honeywell International Inc.
Law Department, AB/2
101 Columbia Road
Morristown, NJ 07962

EXAMINER

WU, RUTAO

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3639

DATE MAILED: 11/29/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/027,988	Applicant(s) MEDINA ET AL.	
	Examiner Rutao Wu	Art Unit 3639	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 December 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 20 December 2001 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claims 1-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claims 1 and 6, the phrase "client computer" renders the claim indefinite because it is not clear whether the customer has the sole access to the client computer, or whether the provider of goods or services has sole access to the client computer, or whether both customers and provider of goods or services have access to the client computer.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claims 1-6, 8-9, 11, 12, 14, as far as claims 1-6 are definite*, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Pub No 20030208435 to Posner.

**The examiner here assumes that both the provider of goods and the customer have access to the "client computer"*

Referring to claim 1:

A method implemented via a computerized system for coordinating business information flow to permit a provider of goods or services to prepare a project proposal including a price quote for a project requested by a customer, said system including a central server programmed to execute said method, said method comprising the steps of:

establishing a communications channel between the central server and at least one client computer; [0008], [0023]

creating a statement of work comprising project data corresponding to project details, terms, requirements, and comments using a project information template; [0008]

transmitting the statement of work over the communications channel to the central server from one of the at least one client computer to initiate preparation of the project proposal; [0010], [0013]

Posner does not explicitly disclose searching a resource database storing resource data relating to available resources using a search template to identify and select the available resources suitable for completing the project defined by the statement of work;

However, Posner discloses If the vendor replies "RFP under consideration", then the marketing lead evaluates the Request For Proposal (RFP) and possibly consults with others within the organization and decides whether or not to proceed with a proposal in response thereto. [0041]. Therefore it is within reason to conclude that the marketing lead consults with others within the organization to identify available

Art Unit: 3639

resources suitable for completing the project defined by the RFP before creating a proposal.

processing data relating to selected resources and project data of the statement of work to generate the price quote and prepare the project proposal; and [0008]

preparing an evaluation summary report of the project proposal, detailing the project data and selected resource data of selected available resources for review and approval by the provider of goods or services. [0055]

Referring to claim 2:

the computerized system of Claim 1, further comprising the step of transmitting the evaluation summary report to ones of the at least one client computer accessed by appropriate review department of the provider for review and approval of the project proposal. [0055]

Referring to claim 3:

the method of Claim 2, wherein the evaluation summary report includes financial evaluation of the project proposal, and one of the appropriate review departments is a finance review department. [0059]

Referring to claim 4:

the method of claim 2, wherein the evaluation summary report includes contractual compliance evaluation, and one of the appropriate review departments is a contracts review department. [0057]

Referring to claim 5:

the method of Claim 1, further comprising the step of notifying the customer of the project proposal including the price quote upon approval by the provider. [0059]

Referring to claim 6:

the method of claim 5, wherein the notifying step further comprises the step of transmitting the project proposal over the communications channel to one of the at least one client computer accessed by the customer for viewing. [0035], [0059]

Referring to claim 8:

the method of claim 1, further comprising the step of storing in a personnel database, information relating to internal record of the statement of work access by personnel of the provider. [0037], [0043]

Referring to claim 9:

assigning the transmitted statement of work to a quote advisor for facilitating the preparation of the project proposal from the statement of work; [0048], [0049] and

Posner does not explicitly disclose notifying the assigned quote advisor and the customer of the assignment and contact information of the quote advisor and the customer. However, Posner discloses that vendors that buyer choose to send the RFPs to can be chosen by the buyer from a list, [0039] therefore it is an inherent feature that the customer knows the contact information of the quote advisor. Posner also discloses that after the vendor creates a proposal in response to a buyer RFP, the vendor then submits proposal template to the buyer [0059], therefore it is an inherent feature that the quote advisor also knows the contact information of the customer to be able to send the proposal.

Referring to claim 11:

preparing a tentative statement of work including project data inputted by the customer through use of a tentative statement of work template; [0048], [0049]

Transmitting the tentative statement of work over the communications channel to the central server from one of the at least one client computer accessed by the customer to generate a tentative order of magnitude [0047]-[0055]

Notifying the customer of the tentative order of magnitude via the communication channel for acceptance; [0059], [0060] and

Converting the tentative statement of work upon acceptance of the tentative order of magnitude. [0034]

Referring to claim 12:

the method of Claim 7 further comprising the steps of:

Qualifying a user of one of the at least one client computer for access of the central server through input of a userid code and a corresponding password code; and [0050]

Identifying the user as a company user or a customer user. [0050], [0054], [0055]

Referring to claim 14:

the method of Claim 6, further comprising the step of receiving acceptance or rejection of the project proposal from the customer over the communications channel from one of the client computers accessed by the customer. [0013], [0059]

Art Unit: 3639

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 7, 10, 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Posner in view of U.S. Pub No. 20010032172 to Moulinet et al.

Referring to claim 7:

Posner does not disclose the method of claim 1, further comprising the step of storing in a customer database, status information corresponding to current status and history of the statement of work in the business information flow for view by the customer.

Moulinet et al discloses in one embodiment of the invention the screen 240 provides a listing of the projects initiated by the user of the client system, and the various RFPs prepared and submitted by the user of the client system are tracked so that the status of the RFPs can be reported to the user.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Posner's invention to include the ability to record the RFPs initiated by a user and provide the user with information on the project such as Name, Date(s) and Status. One would be motivated to perform such modification so the users can track the projects and thus providing them with valuable information on the statement of work.

Referring to claim 10:

Art Unit: 3639

Posner does not disclose posting flag dates for at least one event during the preparation of the project proposal and notifying the provider of the passing of the flag dates for each corresponding event.

Moulinet et al discloses a screen that can be displayed by the client system that displays various fields for identifying the user's project and their status, including dates that the RFP was created, sent to the service providers on the short list, and/or due dates for receipt of a proposal or completing of the project. [0079]

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Posner's invention to include posting and displaying the due dates of certain aspects of the proposal process. One would be motivated to perform such a modification to ensure that the proposals are worked on in a timely manner and ensure that the customer receives a response as quickly as possible to not obstruct the business process.

Referring to claim 13:

Posner does not disclose the step of limiting access by the customer user to the central server for searching and viewing status of each statement of work created by the customer user on the customer database.

Posner does disclose an access code login system that verifies if the user has the appropriate access before the user is allowed to perform actions related to the RFP [0050]-[0055]

Moulinet et al discloses the ability to allow user to review a listing of the projects initiated by the user of the client system. Users are allowed to view information such as Name, Date(s) and Status of the statement of work. [0079], [0080]

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Posner's invention to allow customers to review information regarding the projects initiated by those customers based on their login access. One would be motivated to perform such a modification to allow customers secure access to view their statements of work and ensure only the users with possession of the login information can log in and view the information.

Conclusion

1. Examiner's Note: Examiner has cited particular columns and line numbers in the references as applied to the claims below for the convenience of the applicant.

Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings in the art and are applied to the specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested that the applicant, in preparing the responses, fully consider the references in entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the examiner.

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

U.S. Pat No. 6,301,574 to Thomas et al.

U.S. Pat No. 6,446,053 to Elliott.


U.S. Pub No. 20030208434 to Posner.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Rutao Wu whose telephone number is (571)272-3136. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 8-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Hayes can be reached on (571)272-6708. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

rw


JOHN W. HAYES
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER